DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 964 EA 022 660

AUTHOR Smith, James M.
TITLE Experiential Learning in a Nondoctoral Setting: Are the Needs of Preservice Principals Truly Being Fulfilled?
PUB DATE Aug 90
NOTE 56p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (Los Angeles, CA, August 12-17, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Cooperative Learning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Experiential Learning; Higher Education; Leadership Training; Management Development; *Principals; Professional Education; Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

Outcomes of the Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals (EPPSP) at Butler University in Indiana, an alternative process for training preservice school administrators, are presented in this report. The study examines the differences in perceptions of program preparation experience, instructional preferences, and overall satisfaction between graduates of nontraditional and traditional educational administration programs. Questionnaires were administered to 124 out of 168 EPPSP graduates, a 74 percent response rate, and to 844 Mississippi administrators who graduated from traditional programs. With the exception of the content area dealing with financial management skills, the EPPSP graduates expressed the belief that each of the content areas was more strongly developed by their program than did traditional program graduates. Overall, EPPSP graduates perceived themselves as better prepared for their educational leadership roles than did traditional program graduates. The most frequently recommended instructional modes for administrator preparation programs included group process training, internships, and games and simulations. Appendices include copies of each questionnaire and related correspondence. (11 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328964

Experiential Learning In A Nondoctoral Setting: Are The Needs Of Preservice Principals Truly Being Fulfilled?

James M. Smith
Director
The Experiential Program For Preparing School Principals
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the
National Council of Professors of Educational Administration
Los Angeles, California
August, 1990

EA 022 660

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. M. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Experiential Learning In A Nondoctoral Setting: Are The Needs Of Preservice Principals Truly Being Fulfilled?

During the course of the past nine years, a select group of faculty members and graduate students at Butler University have been actively engaged in an alternative process for training preservice school administrators. The Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals (EPPSP) was designed and continues to operate as an andragogical learning center. As a center for adult learning, students work on projects as collaborative teams; learn through self-direction; capitalize on prior experience; and actively engage in critical and reflective thinking processes (Smith, 1989). These students, working in cohort groups, are extensively exposed to professional research but, likewise, are given the opportunity to implement ideas, concepts, and methodologies gained from this material in an actual school setting. Through the use of an experiential instructional model, students are no longer expected to merely study about curricular issues, financial practices, or the management of school facilities. These students are encouraged to actively acquire new information, strive for identification and understanding of complex concepts and perceive, as well as synthesize, the future implications for this newly acquired informational base. The integration of administrative content with the practice of leadership skills provides each member of the cohort group with the opportunity to embrace the essential concepts of this experiential learning methodology.

As the students and faculty work toward the attainment of the various proficiencies required for EPPSP programmatic completion, extensive use of clinical professors and mentors has become a vital aspect of the teaching and learning process. Mentorship opportunities and structured shadowing experiences are carefully developed in order to serve as an integral element of this preservice administrative program (Lotven & Smith, 1990). As the graduate student interacts with selected mentors, the opportunity to model

appropriate professional behavior and to reflect upon inappropriate action is continuously afforded. Therefore, seminar sessions often move beyond the mere dispersal of information and become transformed into a type of reflective practicum (Schon, 1987); it is in this setting that students are given the opportunity to struggle with the ever present dichotomy between administrative theory and school-based practice.

The Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals has carefully monitored the historic progression of the various reform movements in respect to educational administration preparation. In keeping with the recommendations of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education the EPPSP faculty has continuously attempted to select only the best and brightest candidates for school leadership positions; likewise, the content of the various seminar sessions has painstakingly been designed to be both rigorous and meaningful (Shibles, 1988). Much like the recommendations made by the National Policy Board (1989), the Butler program seeks to consistently blend the academic content presented throughout the thirty-six hour process with actual experiences taking place in K-12 educational settings. Students are persistently encouraged to develop a personal vision for educational leadership and, in turn, to temper this vision with the futuristic realities of school administration within the next two decades (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988).

The most recent publications dealing with the topic of preservice administrator education also validate much of what has been instituted within the confines of EPPSP. Principals for 21st Century Schools (1990) repeatedly speaks of a need for principals to be well grounded in the field of instructional practice. No longer can principals solely assume the role of building manager -- these individuals must become instructional leaders. It is upon this premise that the students are admitted to Butler's program and it is with this holistic philosophy that each programmatic phase is developed. In conjunction with the recommendation concerning instructional competency, the National Association of Elementary School Principals forcefully recommended that programs focusing on the

principalship be given autonomy from those that specialize in central office preparation (1990, p. 22). The title of Butler's program alone recognizes and embraces the need for this differentiation. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990), in its most recent publication, stated:

> The delivery system for ... content areas and process skills should feature concentrated periods of academic study, simulations, clinical training, and field experiences with trained mentors. Learning techniques that are effective with adults must be employed regularly to test the application of analytical abilities, professional knowledge, and process skills (pp. 304).

This statement is not only embraced by the students and faculty working with EPPSP, it is consistently articulated when the program is described as an andragogical learning center.

Rationale for the Study

Given the plethora of research that has recently been dedicated to the redesign of preservice administrator training, the faculty at Butler University began a process of seeking validation for the use of these programmatic structures and methodologies that are unlike those employed by traditional educational administration programs. The most pervasive questions that arose throughout this search process were: Is there a difference in the perceptions of graduates of a nontraditional educational administration program from those of traditional graduates in respect to the effectiveness of the preparation experience? Is there a difference in instructional preferences between graduates of a nontraditional educational administration program and those of graduates from a traditional preparation program? Is there a difference in overall satisfaction in respect to the appropriateness of the graduate training program between graduates of a nontraditional educational administration program and the graduates of a traditional preparation program?

In an attempt to gather data that would provide a representative sample of graduates from traditional educational administration programs, this researcher embarked on an

exhaustive quest through the annals of related literature. During the course of this literature search, a paper completed by Moody, Saterfield, Evans, and Childress (1988) was discovered. After receiving the actual copy of this work and discussing the research design with the primary author, it was clear that a foundational instrument and representative results were contained within this research. Thus, the necessary elements for a replication study were indeed available. Using the aforementioned research questions as a baseline for comparison, responses from traditional and nontraditional educational administration program graduates could now be compared.

Data Collection

Through the use of the 1988 instrument designed by Moody, Saterfield, Evans, and Childress (See Appendix A), a modified instrument was designed for distribution to all graduates of The Experiential Program for Preparing School Principal (See Appendix B). The EPPSP population was comprised of 168 individuals residing primarily within the geographic boundaries of the state of Indiana. Given the relatively small size of this population, it was determined that the entire population would be included in this study. Therefore, on May 25, 1990 all 168 graduates were mailed a letter of transmittal (See Appendix C) and a copy of the modified questionnaire. Two other mailings were completed subsequent to the initial distribution of the questionnaire. By June 29, 1990, 124 of the 168 questionnaires had been returned; this represented a 73.81 percent subject response.

Data Analysis

The Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1988) was employed to compare the results of those graduates who had completed a traditional

educational training program to those who had completed EPPSP. By the use of the statistical program StatView II (Feldman, Gagnon, Hofmann, & Simpson, 1987), probabilities were determined at the .01 level. Because the two samples were quite different in size (N=844 and N=124), proportional representations were determined for the expected column (Mississippi), while actual sample sizes were maintained for the observed (EPPSP).

The following sections display the responses of both the Mississippi administrators and the graduates of The Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals. After each question, a Chi-Square Table appears displaying the raw data provided from each group; a second table is also presented with the proportional representations for the expected column and the raw scores of the observed column. These proportional representations were determined by multiplying the percentage of the expected results gained by the actual number of returns for the observed. The probabilities and the corresponding statements of trends determined by this Goodness of Fit technique were based on the proportional representations and not on the raw data.

Section I: Differences in Perception in Respect to Program Effectiveness

The data outlined below examines the difference in perception of graduates of a nontraditional educational administration program to those of traditional program graduates in respect to the effectiveness of the preparation experience. As stated above, the statistical treatment employed to form such a determination was the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test. Chi-Square tables have been constructed for each of the question areas. For the purpose of this section, the numerical indicators that appear vertically along the left margin of each table represent the extent to which the graduates felt that the various skill areas were developed in their university preparation program. As a means of consistency, both the Mississippi study and the Butler study employed the following numerical equivalencies:

1= Not developed; 2= Slightly developed; 3= Moderately developed; and 4= Highly Developed.

Question 1: To what extent were planning skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	0	1	35
2	13	2	218
3	44	3	387
4	66	4	129

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	0	6.15
2	13	34.44
3	44	61.50
4	66	20.91

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 1 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 121.706. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were many fewer responses (-21.44) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would

have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (45.09) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their planning skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 2: To what extent were organizing and delegating skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	2	1	26
2	10	2	226
3	53	3	434
4	58	4	141

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	2	3.69
2	10	33.21
3	53	63.96
4	58	21.140

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 2 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 76.955. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in respect to responses given a rating of 2 or 4.

There were many fewer responses (-23.21) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (35.86) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their organizing and delegating skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 3: To what extent were recommending and implementing policy skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	3	1	46
2	16	2	287
3	60	3	365
4	44	4	127

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	3	7.38
2	16	41.82
3	60	54.12
4	44	19.68

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 3 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 49.234. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference

between the two groups can be found in respect to responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were many fewer responses (-25.82) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (24.32) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their ability to recommend and implement policy was, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 4: To what extent were decision making skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	34
2	4	2	168
3	28	3	393
4	90	4	177

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	4.92
2	4	27.06
3	28	62.73
4	90	28.29

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 4 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 176.613 The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 3 or 4. There were many fewer responses (-34.73) to "Moderately Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses of the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a far greater number of responses (61.71) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their decision making skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 5: To what extent were supervisory skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	22
2	10	2	114
3	56	3	416
4	56	4	254

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	3.69
2	10	17.22
3	56	63.96
4	56	38.13

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 5 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 14.345. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0025. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 3 or 4. There were fewer responses (-7.96) to "Moderately Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (17.87) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their supervisory skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 6: To what extent were evaluating skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	32
2	5	2	230
3	48	3	362
4	70	4	179

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	4.96
2	5	35.96
3	48	55.35
4	70	27.28

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 6 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 97.692. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were fewer responses (-30.96) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (42.72) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their evaluating skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 7: To what extent were problem solving skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	40
2	5	2	239
3	32	3	379
4	85	4	146

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	6.15
2	5	36.90
3	32	56.58
4	85	23.37

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 7 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 97.692. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were fewer responses (-31.90) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (61.63) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their problem solving skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 8: To what extent were professional improvement sills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	0	1	52
2	1	2	141
3	11	3	408
4	111	4	243

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	0	7.38
2	1	20.74
3	11	59.04
4	111	35.67

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 8 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 224.344. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 3 or 4. There were a great deal fewer responses (-48.04) to "Moderately Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a much greater number of responses (75.33) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their professional improvement skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 9: To what extent were financial management skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	14	1	115
2	62	2	243
3	43	3	343
4	5	4	135

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	14	17.36
2	62	35.98
3	43	50.84
4	5	19.84

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 9 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 31.777. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were a greater number of responses (26.02) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were fewer responses (-14.840) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their financial management skills were, in general, less strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 10: To what extent were communication skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	0	1	19
2	2	2	148
3	22	3	452
4	99	4	205

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	0	2.44
2	2	22.140
3	22	67.650
4	99	30.75

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 10 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 203.047. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 3 or 4. There were fewer responses (-45.65) to "Moderately Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (68.25) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their communication skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 11: To what extent were motivational skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	26
2	4	2	223
3	37	3	412
4	81	4	153

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	3.69
2	4	33.21
3	37	62.73
4	81	23.37

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 11 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 180.321. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 2 or 4. There were fewer responses (-29.21) to "Slightly Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (57.63) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their motivational skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Question 12: To what extent were human relations skills developed in your university preparation program?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	1	1	35
2	4	2	169
3	21	3	404
4	98	4	213

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	1	4.96
2	4	24.80
3	21	60.76
4	98	33.48

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 12 yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 170.963. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the two groups can be found in responses given a rating of 3 or 4. There were fewer responses (-39.76) to "Moderately Developed" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses from the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were a greater number of responses (64.52) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Highly Developed." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates feel that their human relations skills were, in general, more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study.

Section II: Differences in Instructional Preference

The data outlined below examines the differences in perception of graduates of a nontraditional educational administration program from those of traditional graduates in respect to instructional delivery strategies. As is stated in an earlier section of this paper, the statistical treatment employed to form such a determination was the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test. Chi-Square tables have been constructed for each of the question

areas. For the purpose of this section, the numerical indicators that appear vertically along the left margin of each table represent the instructional areas that might be employed to teach each of the content areas. As a means of consistency, both the Mississippi study and the Butler study employed the following numerical equivalencies: 1= Clinical Study; 2= Group Process Training; 3= Instructional Modules; 4= Individual and Team Research; 5= Computer-Assisted Instruction; 6= Lecture and Discussion; 7= Games and Simulations; 8= Internship; 9= Tutorial and Seminars. Definitions for each of the instructional strategies can be found in both Appendix A and Appendix B.

Question 1: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of planning skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	14	1	42
2	36	2	207
3	7	3	132
4	7	4	54
5	10	5	21
6	3	6	91
7	13	7	56
8	30	8	121
9	2	9	28

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	14	6.10
2	36	32.94
3	7	20.74
4	7	8.54
5	10	3.66
6	3	14.64
7	13	8.54
8	30	19.52
9	2	7.32

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 1 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 51.955. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group selected Group Process Training as the most preferred instructional mode for the teaching of planning skills. The second most selected mode was that of the Internship for the Butler group and Instructional Modules for the Mississippi group. Given this data, it appears that both groups were in agreement that Group Process Training should be the instructional mode utilized for the teaching of planning skills.

Question 2: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of organizing and delegating skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	11	1	39
2	39	2	70
3	2	3	75
4	5	4	11
5	1	5	63
6	3	6	77
7	17	7	75
8	39	8	116
9	4	9	34

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	11	8.68
2	39	14.88
3	2	16.12
4	5	2.48
5	1	13.64
6	3	17.36
7	17	16.12
8	39	26.04
9	4	8.68

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 2 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 87.26. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group selected the Internship as one of the most preferred instructional modes for the teaching of planning skills. The Butler group also selected Group Process Training with equal frequency to that of the Internship. The second most selected mode of instruction from the Mississippi group was Lecture and Discussion. Given this data, it appears that both groups were in agreement that the Internship should be the instructional mode utilized for the teaching of organizing and delegating skills.

Question 3: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of recommending and implementing policy skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	17	1	51
2	12	2	162
3	15	3	108
4	28	4	7
5	0	5	94
6	12	6	119
7	11	7	47
8	19	8	99
9	8	9	40

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	17	8.54
2	12	26.84
3	15	18.30
4	28	1.22
5	0	15.86
6	12	19.52
7	11	7.32
8	19	17.08
9	8	7.32

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 3 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 625.91. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The Mississippi group selected Group Process Training as the primary mode of instruction in respect to recommending and implementing policy skills. The Butler group selected Individual and Team Research as the primary mode of instruction in this area. Mississippi's second choice for instructional mode was Lecture and Discussion, while an Internship was the second choice for the Butler group. Given this data, it appears that agreement between the two groups does not exist in respect to a preferred instructional mode for the teaching of recommending and implementing policy skills.

Question 4: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of decision making skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	13	1	75
2	35	2	192
3	1	3	60
4	7	4	17
5	1	5	63
6	0	6	46
7	45	7	170
8	18	8	103
9	3	9	32

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	13	12.30
2	35	30.75
3	1	9.840
4	7	2.46
5	1	9.84
6	0	7.38
7	45	27.06
8	18	15.99
9	3	7.38

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 4 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 47.015. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The Mississippi group selected Group Process Training as the primary mode of instruction in respect to decision making skills. The Butler group selected Games and Simulations as the primary mode of instruction for this area. Mississippi's second choice was Games and Simulations, while Group Process Training was the second choice for the Butler group. Given this data, it appears that both groups would utilize either Group Process Training or Games and Simulations for the instruction of decision making skills.

Question 5: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of supervisory skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	20	1	68
2	9	2	103
3	8	3	79
4	2	4	6
5	0	5	32
6	1	6	77
7	11	7	62
8	67	8	265
9	5	9	41

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	20	11.07
2	9	17.22
3	8	13.53
4	2	1.23
5	0	4.920
6	1	13.52
7	11	9.84
8	67	44.28
9	5	7.38

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 5 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 42.946. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group selected the Internship as the most preferred instructional mode for the teaching of supervisory skills. The second most selected mode of instruction from the Mississippi group was Group Process Training, while the Butler group selected Clinical Study as a second choice. Given this data, it appears that both groups were in agreement that the Internship should be the instructional mode utilized for the teaching of supervisory skills.

Question 6: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of evaluation skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	21	1	90
2	13	2	120
3	17	3	140
4	4	4	29
5	0	5	67
6	5	6	41
7	26	7	51
8	27	8	175
9	8	9	30

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	21	15.73
2	13	19.360
3	17	22.99
4	4	4.84
5	0	10.89
6	5	6.05
7	26	8.47
8	27	27.83
9	8	4.84

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 6 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 55.003. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group selected the Internship as the most preferred instructional mode for the teaching of evaluation skills. The second most selected mode of instruction from the Mississippi group was Instructional Modules, while the Butler group selected Games and Simulations as a second choice. Given this data, it appears that both groups were in agreement that the Internship should be the instructional mode utilized for the teaching of evaluation skills.

Question 7: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of problem solving skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	4	1	70
2	46	2	234
3	1	3	55
4	7	4	14
5	1	5	64
6	1	6	29
7	52	7	133
8	6	8	77
9	2	9	43

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	4	12.00
2	46	38.40
3	1	9.60
4	7	2.40
5	1	10.80
6	1	4.80
7	52	21.60
8	6	13.20
9	2	7.20

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 7 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 85.727. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The Mississippi group selected Group Process Training as the primary mode of instruction in respect to problem solving skills. The Butler group selected Games and Simulations as the primary mode of instruction for this area. Mississippi's second choice was Games and Simulations, while Group Process Training was the second choice for the Butler group. Given this data, it appears that both groups would utilize either Group Process Training or Games and Simulations for the instruction of problem solving skills.

Question 8: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of professional improvement skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	8	1	32
2	15	2	116
3	12	3	63
4	17	4	11
5	0	5	70
6	4	6	87
7	4	7	25
8	34	8	116
9	26	9	176

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	8	7.20
2	15	20.40
3	12	10.80
4	17	1.20
5	0	12.00
6	4	14.40
7	4	3.60
8	34	20.40
9	26	30.00

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 8 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 238.841. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The Mississippi group selected Tutorials and Seminars as the primary mode of instruction in respect to developing professional improvement skills. The Butler group selected the Internship as the primary mode of instruction for this area. Mississippi's second choices were the Internship and Group Process Training (each receiving 116 responses), while Tutorials and Seminars was the second choice for the Butler group. Given this data, it appears that both groups would utilize either Tutorials and Seminars or the Internship for the teaching of professional improvement skills.

Question 9: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of financial management skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	5	1	35
2	5	2	103
3	33	3	72
4	2	4	67
5	20	5	56
6	21	6	97
7	8	7	38
8	25	8	119
9	5	9	137

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	5	6.20
2	5	17.36
3	33	13.64
4	2	11.16
5	20	9.92
6	21	16.12
7	8	6.20
8	25	19.84
9	5	23.56

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 9 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 72.235. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The Mississippi group selected Tutorials and Seminars as the primary mode of instruction in respect to developing financial management skills. The Butler group selected the Internship as the primary mode of instruction for this area. Mississippi's second choice was the Internship, while Instructional Modules was the second choice for the Butler group. Given this data, it appears that the Internship was one instructional mode that each group would strongly suggest as a means of developing financial management skills.

Question 10: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of communication skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	3	1	30
2	61	2	277
3	5	3	83
4	2	4	13
5	2	5	14
6	4	6	74
7	26	7	145
8	15	8	49
9	3	9	59

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	3	4.84
2	61	44.77
3	5	13.31
4	2	2.42
5	2	2.24
6	4	12.10
7	26	22.99
8	15	7.26
9	3	10.89

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 10 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 31.655. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group overwhelmingly selected Group Process Training as the preferred means of instruction for the teaching of communication skills. Agreement also occurred in respect to a second selection for instructional preference; here both groups identified Games and Simulations as a second choice for teaching communication skills. Given this data, it would appear that each group strongly suggests the use of Group Process Training as the means for developing communication skills.

Question 11: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of motivational skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	7	1	46
2	44	2	215
3	7	3	100
4	4	4	5
5	0	5	50
6	3	6	65
7	25	7	134
8	23	8	49
9	10	9	65

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	7	7.38
2	44	35.67
3	7	17.08
4	4	1.23
5	0	8.61
6	3	11.07
7	25	22.14
8	23	8.61
9	10	11.07

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 11 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 53.168. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group overwhelmingly selected Group Process Training as the preferred means of instruction for the teaching of motivational skills. Agreement also occurred in respect to a second selection for instructional preference; here both groups identified Games and Simulations as a second choice for teaching motivational skills. Given this data, it would appear that each group strongly suggest the use of Group Process Training as the means of instruction in respect to the development of motivational skills.

Question 12: What instructional modes do you believe should be utilized in the instruction of human relations skills?

Raw Data

Butler	Responses	Mississippi	Responses
1	4	1	49
2	59	2	253
3	3	3	78
4	2	4	6
5	0	5	23
6	2	6	56
7	23	7	120
8	22	8	75
9	4	9	50

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	4	8.33
2	59	42.84
3	3	13.09
4	2	1.19
5	0	3.57
6	2	9.52
7	23	20.23
8	22	11.90
9	4	8.33

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to Question 12 yielded a Chi-Square (with eight degrees of freedom) equal to 37.388. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. Although the distributions were indeed dissimilar, both the Mississippi group and the Butler group overwhelmingly selected Group Process Training as the preferred means of instruction for the teaching of human relations skills. Agreement also occurred in respect to a second selection for instructional preference; here both groups identified Games and Simulations as a second choice for teaching human relations skills. Given this data, it would appear that both groups strongly suggest the use of Group Process Training as the means of instruction in respect to the development of human relations skills.

Section III: Differences In Satisfaction With Administrative Preparation Programs

The data outlined below examines the difference in satisfaction levels of nontraditional educational administration program graduates from those of traditional graduates in respect to the totality of the administrative preparation experience. As is stated in an earlier section of this paper, the statistical treatment employed to form such a determination was the Chi-Square Goodness of Fit Test. Chi-Square tables have been constructed for each of the question areas. For the purpose of this section, the numerical indicators that appear vertically along the left margin of each table represent the various levels of satisfaction that were offered. As a means of consistency, both the Mississippi study and the Butler study employed the following numerical equivalencies: 1= Very Well; 2= Fairly Well; 3= Not Too Well; 4= Not Well At All.

How well did the university training program prepare you for your current position?

Raw Data

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	87	130
2	28	425
3	3	127
4	0	28

Chi-Square Table: Proportional Representation

	Butler (Observed)	Mississippi (Expected)
1	87	21.24
2	28	70.80
3	3	21.40
4	0	4.72

The Goodness of Fit Test for responses to the aforementioned question yielded a Chi-Square (with three degrees of freedom) equal to 250.01. The probability that these distributions occurred simply as a result of chance is .0001. The most noteworthy areas of difference between the groups can be found in responses given a rating of 1 or 2. There was a much greater response (65.76) to "Very Well" from the Butler group than would have been expected given the responses of the Mississippi group. Likewise, there were many fewer responses (-42.80) than expected from the Butler group in respect to "Fairly Well." Given this data, it would appear that Butler's EPPSP graduates felt that their overall educational administration preparation program provided a more appropriate background for their current occupational position than did those in the Mississippi study.

Conclusions

The responses from graduates of traditional educational administration programs now administering in the state of Mississippi differed significantly from those who completed administrative training in Butler University's Experiential Program for Preparing

School Principals; these differences were found throughout the entirety of this study. With the exception of one specific content area dealing with financial management skills, the EPPSP graduates displayed a belief that each of the content areas (i.e., planning, organizing and delegating, recommending and implementing policy, decision making, supervising, evaluating, solving problems, improving professionally, communicating, motivating people, and relating to people) was more strongly developed by their administrator training program than did those in the Mississippi study. Although the distributions were dissimilar in respect to the instructional modes suggested for the teaching of each content area, first and second choice selections for each area had considerable overlap between the Mississippi and Butler groups. Only one content area (recommending and implementing policy) provided no agreement for a primary or secondary choice in respect to instructional mode. In the final section of the study, EPPSP graduates indicated that their program prepared them "very well" at a rate four times greater than would have been expected given the results of the Mississippi group. Likewise, none of the one hundred twenty-four EPPSP respondents indicated that the program prepared them "not well at all."

Given this data, it can be concluded that EPPSP graduates felt better prepared for their roles as educational leaders than did those who are now administering in the state of Mississippi. This information would appear to be particularly helpful to individuals who are currently redesigning principalship preparation programs. The Butler University model might serve well as a reference point for initial program planning. Additionally, the similarity of response from both groups concerning the instructional modes most appropriate for each of the content areas might benefit all involved in the training of future school administrators. If two diverse groups have identified and agreed upon the primary and secondary instructional modes most appropriate for the teaching of certain generic skills, it would appear remiss for academia to ignore these recommendations. Particularly important to this concept would be the examination of those instructional modes most

commonly recommended. Included in this list of were: Group Process Training, the Internship, and Games and Simulations.

The reform literature in respect to educational administration preparation is replete with suggestions for programmatic improvement. This study validates many of these recommendations and provides further insight into the structured opinions of program participants. It is through the responses of such participants that continued research will provide a foundation for meaningful discourse centered upon true, field-based, educational reform.

APPENDIX A:

THE 1988 MISSISSIPPI QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

WHAT THE RESPONDENT MIGHT LIKE TO KNOW ABOUT THIS SURVEY

What is the purpose of the survey?

The purpose of this survey is to study opinions of administrators regarding (1) your previous administrator training, and (2) your recommendations for how to improve preparation programs.

How is confidentiality treated in this survey?

The survey procedures follow the ethical guidelines for survey research put forward by the American Association for Public Opinion Research. Accordingly, confidentiality will be maintained at all times. Respondents' names will not appear on questionnaire response sheets. Moreover, all the results will be released in such a way so that no single administrator can ever be identified.

How will the findings be released?

The findings will be presented in the form of a monograph to be disseminated by the School Executive Management Institute.

Who will use the findings?

The results will be of interest to those involved in administrator preparation, state certification officials, and practicing administrators.

Survey of Mississippi School Administrators
Part I

Instructions:

A. READ each item carefully.
B. THINK about the extent to which your administrator preparation program developed your skill in that area.
C. DECIDE whether your skill was (1) not developed, (2) slightly developed, (3) moderately developed, or (4) highly developed through your administrator preparation program.
D. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the four numbers (1 2 3 4) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

1 - Not Developed
2 - Slightly Developed
3 - Moderately Developed
4 - Highly Developed

Skill	Rating
1. Planning	1 2 3 4
2. Organizing and Delegating	1 2 3 4
3. Recommending and Implementing Policy	1 2 3 4
4. Decision Making	1 2 3 4
5. Supervising	1 2 3 4
6. Evaluating	1 2 3 4
7. Solving Problems	1 2 3 4
8. Improving Professionally	1 2 3 4
9. Managing Finances	1 2 3 4
10. Communicating	1 2 3 4
11. Motivating People	1 2 3 4
12. Relating to People	1 2 3 4

Survey of Mississippi School Administrators
Part II

Instructions:

A. THINK about the modes of instruction used in your university preparation program to develop each skill.
B. DECIDE the three modes of instruction most frequently used.
C. RANK ORDER the three modes most frequently used by placing a 1 in the column of the most frequently used mode, by placing a 2 in the column of the second most frequently used mode, and by placing a 3 in the column of the third most frequently used mode. Do not mark in any of the other columns.
D. DECIDE the effectiveness of each of the three most frequently used modes of instruction you identified for a skill item, and place the letter (A B C D) of the rating which best represents your opinion of the effectiveness of this mode in the same column you used to rank order the frequency of use of the mode.

Effectiveness Ratings

A. Not Effective
B. Minimally Effective
C. Moderately Effective
D. Highly Effective

Skill	Instructional Mode								
	Clinical Study	Group Process Training	Instructional Modules	Computer Assisted Instruction	Individual and Team Research	Lecture and Discussion	Games and Simulations	Internships	Tutorials and Seminars
1. Planning									
2. Organizing and Delegating									
3. Recommending & Implementing Policy									
4. Decision Making									
5. Supervising									
6. Evaluating									
7. Solving Problems									
8. Improving Professionally									
9. Managing Finances									
10. Communicating									
11. Motivating People									
12. Relating to People									

GLOSSARY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODES

CLINICAL STUDY: Experiences requiring the application of knowledge to the tasks and functions of a role in the field.

COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION: Use of computers for gathering data, problem solving, or engaging in application-level simulations.

GAMES AND SIMULATIONS: Structured activities that require rule learning and rule-following behaviors that approximate conditions faced in actual settings. Activities may be structured for problem solving through the use of case studies, in-baskets, or critical incidents.

GROUP PROCESS TRAINING: Organized instruction involving participation in various types of groups; e.g., human relations training groups, problem-solving groups, discussion groups, and task groups.

INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM RESEARCH: Activities directed toward investigation of a problem that require application of established research methodologies, either working alone or as a member of a research team.

INTERNSHIP: A field-based experience calling for application of various generic skills and a range of specific skills related to administration. Direction is provided by a college/university supervisor or site mentor.

INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES: Programmed content presented sequentially on a given topic to assist learners in developing understanding and skills for later application.

LECTURE/DISCUSSION: A teacher-directed instructional methodology that emphasizes presentation of information and discussion of academic content.

TUTORIALS AND SEMINARS: A methodology that engages one or more instructors with one or more students in an examination of academic content.

Survey of Mississippi School Administrators
Part III

Up to this point the instructions have asked you to respond in terms of your previous university preparation program. This section of the survey allows you to offer recommendations for training for the future.

Instructions:

From the modes of instruction listed below,

(A) SELECT the mode you believe would be most effective in developing each skill.
(B) WRITE the mode you have selected as the most effective in the space provided after each skill.

Modes of Instruction

Clinical Study	Group Process Training	Instructional Modules
Computer-Assisted Instruction	Individual and Team Research	Lecture and Discussion
Games and Simulations	Internships	Tutorials and Seminars

Skill	Most Effective Mode of Instruction
1. Planning	
2. Organizing and Delegating	
3. Recommending & Implementing Policy	
4. Decision Making	
5. Supervising	
6. Evaluating	
7. Solving Problems	
8. Improving Professionally	
9. Managing Finances	
10. Communicating	
11. Motivating People	
12. Relating to People	

Survey of Mississippi School Administrators
Part IV

Your current position (Circle one number.)

1. Principal
2. Assistant Principal
3. Superintendent
4. Assistant Superintendent
5. Vocational Director
6. Other Central Office Administrator

1. How well did your university administrator preparation program prepare you for your current position? (Circle one number.)

   1. Very well
   2. Fairly well
   3. Not too well
   4. Not well at all

2. Have you recently been involved in the formal training of other administrators? (Circle one number.)

   1. Yes 2. No

3. Have you ever taught a graduate course in educational administration? (Circle one number.)

   1. Yes 2. No

4. What two courses or instructional areas in your administrator preparation program were most helpful for you to meet the demands of your job?

   1. _____

   2. _____

5. In your opinion, in what way was your administrator preparation program particularly good?

6. What is the single most important way to improve graduate instruction in educational administration departments?

APPENDIX B:

THE 1990 BUTLER UNIVERSITY QUESTIONNAIRE

BUTLER UNIVERSITY SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Section I

Instructions:

A. READ each item carefully.
B. THINK about the extent to which your administrator preparation program developed your skill in that area.
C. DECIDE whether your skill was (1) not developed, (2) slightly developed, (3) moderately developed, or (4) highly developed through your administrator preparation program.
D. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the four numbers (1 2 3 4) following the item to show the answer you have selected.

1 - Not Developed
2 - Slightly Developed
3 - Moderately Developed
4 - Highly Developed

	Skill	Rating			
1.	Planning	1	2	3	4
2.	Organizing and Delegating	1	2	3	4
3.	Recommending and Implementing Policy	1	2	3	4
4.	Decision Making	1	2	3	4
5.	Supervising	1	2	3	4
6.	Evaluating	1	2	3	4
7.	Solving Problems	1	2	3	4
8.	Improving Professionally	1	2	3	4
9.	Managing Finances	1	2	3	4
10.	Communicating	1	2	3	4
11.	Motivating People	1	2	3	4
12.	Relating to People	1	2	3	4

BUTLER UNIVERSITY SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Section II

Instructions:

A. Read each term outlined below.
B. Think about these terms as they apply to administrative preparation programs.
C. Use these terms to respond to each item in Section III of this survey.

GLOSSARY OF INSTRUCTIONAL MODES

CLINICAL STUDY: Experiences requiring the application of knowledge to the tasks and functions of a role in the field.

COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION: Use of computers for gathering data, problem solving, or engaging in application-level simulations.

GAMES AND SIMULATIONS: Structured activities that require rule learning and rule-following behaviors that approximate conditions faced in actual settings. Activities may be structured for problem solving through the use of case studies, in-baskets, or critical incidents.

GROUP PROCESS TRAINING: Organized instruction involving participation in various types of groups; e.g., human relations training groups, problem-solving groups, discussion groups, and task groups.

INDIVIDUAL AND TEAM RESEARCH: Activities directed toward investigation of a problem that require application of established research methodologies, either working alone or as a member of a research team.

INTERNSHIP: A field-based experience calling for application of various generic skills and a range of specific skills related to administration. Direction is provided by a college/university supervisor or site mentor.

INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES: Programmed content presented sequentially on a given topic to assist learners in developing understanding and skills for later application.

LECTURE/DISCUSSION: A teacher-directed instructional methodology that emphasizes presentation of information and discussion of academic content.

TUTORIALS AND SEMINARS: A methodology that engages one or more instructors with one or more students in an examination of academic content.

BUTLER UNIVERSITY SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Section III

Up to this point the instructions have asked you to respond in terms of your previous university preparation program. This section of the survey allows you to offer recommendations for training for the future.

Instructions:

From the modes of instruction listed below,

(A) SELECT the mode you believe would be most effective in developing each skill.
(B) WRITE the mode you have selected as the most effective in the space provided after each skill.

Modes of Instruction

Clinical Study	Group Process Training	Instructional Modules
Computer-Assisted Instruction	Individual and Team Research	Lecture and Discussion
Games and Simulations	Internships	Tutorials and Seminars

	Skill	Most Effective Mode of Instruction
1.	Planning	
2.	Organizing and Delegating	
3.	Recommending & Implementing Policy	
4.	Decision Making	
5.	Supervising	
6.	Evaluating	
7.	Solving Problems	
8.	Improving Professionally	
9.	Managing Finances	
10.	Communicating	
11.	Motivating People	
12.	Relating to People	

BUTLER UNIVERSITY SURVEY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PREPARATION PROGRAMS
Section IV

Your current position (Circle one number.)

1. Classroom Teacher
2. Principal
3. Assistant Principal
4. Superintendent
5. Other Central Office Administrator
6. Other_____

1. How well did your university administrator preparation program prepare you for your current position? (Circle one number.)

   1. Very well
   2. Fairly well
   3. Not too well
   4. Not well at all

2. Have you recently been involved in the formal training of other administrators? (Circle one number.)

   1. Yes 2. No

3. Have you ever taught a graduate course in educational administration? (Circle one number.)

   1. Yes 2. No

4. What two elements or instructional areas in your administrator preparation program were most helpful for you to meet the demands of your job?

   1. _____

   2. _____

5. In your opinion, in what ways was your administrator preparation program particularly good?

6. What is the single most important way to improve graduate instruction in educational administration programs?

APPENDIX C:

THE LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL FOR BUTLER UNIVERSITY GRADUATES

BUTLER UNIVERSITY

Department of Teacher Education
4600 Sunset Avenue
Indianapolis, Indiana 46208
317/283-9517

May 7, 1990

Dear EPPSP Graduate:

During the past two years I have had the opportunity to present material concerning our program to audiences across the nation. Without question, EPPSP has received great support from professionals interested in reforming the preparation process for potential school leaders. Nonetheless, our critics have asked for research data that validates experiential learning as a powerful mechanism for obtaining such reform. It is in response to statements of this nature that I am now completing a survey of all those who have completed the Experiential Program for Preparing School Principals.

Enclosed you will find a brief questionnaire that is a replication of an earlier instrument used in the state of Mississippi. I would like to request that you take a few minutes to complete this form and return it in the enclosed envelope. Needless to say, this is an important project for our program; Joe Nygaard, Jim Ellsberry, and I anxiously await your response.

As you will notice, each questionnaire and corresponding envelope is numbered. This is merely to record returned material and will in no way be used for distribution or personal identification.

Please return all completed material by May 28, 1990. Thank you for your time, effort, and commitment to EPPSP.

Sincerely,

James M. Smith
Director, EPPSP

References

Feldman, D. S., Gagnon, J., Hofmann, R., & Simpson, J. (1987). Statview II. Berkely, CA: Abacus Concepts.

Griffiths, D. E. Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1988). Leaders for America's schools. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Lotven, B. A., & Smith, J. M. (1990). Teacher empowerment and administrator training: Shared encounter or clash of wills. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Moody, L., Saterfield, T. H., Evans, A., & Childress, E. L. (1988). An evaluation of their preparation programs by Mississippi school administrators. Paper presented at he annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Louisville, KY.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990) Principals for 21st century schools. Alexandria, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1990). The preparation of school administrators. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Schon, D.A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shibles, M. R. (1988). School leadership preparation: A preface for action. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Smith, J. M. (1989). Preparing principals for the future: Experiential learning in educational administration. Education, 109, 490-493.